

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

The current control of the media by a limited number of corporate-controlled companies has had the effect of featuring, almost totally, the views of vested interests, primarily corporations. A democracy will not survive if information is unavailable. It is indeed regrettable and dangerous that the "other side of the story" is rarely heard. This change in rules will intensify special-interest dominance. I am far less worried about the cost of the media (TV, cable, newspapers) than I am about being able to hear both sides of the story. To have to go to European and Canadian newspapers to get it is indeed shameful. E.g. or support for the overthrow of Hugo Chavez in Venezuela - why did we have to hear that from Greg Palast in London. And why has there been no meaningful coverage from our mainstream press? Why did we have to learn that Gore won the election of 2000 from London papers and, here again, why no coverage from the media. There is no media independence and that will lead straight to the loss of democracy in my country.